

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **3 October 2006** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 32. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothrock (USPN 5,408,470, hereinafter “Rothrock”), in view of Bauer (USPN 5,870,759 hereinafter “Bauer”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 12, and 32 were rejected as being unpatentable over Rothrock in view of Bauer.

Applicant respectfully points out that Rothrock **teaches away** from the present invention because it requires an arbitrator to facilitate communication when there are three or more systems (see Rothrock, col. 3, lines 5-12). In contrast to Rothrock, the present invention directly sends object change sets from one system to another even when there are three or more systems (see page 2, lines 10-16). In the Office Action dated 08 July 2005, the Examiner stated that *“in situations of more than two systems [Rothrock’s] teachings would **teach away**”* (see page 12, lines 6-7 of the Office Action dated 08 July 2005). Similarly, in the Office Action dated 03 October 2006, the Examiner stated that Rothrock does not teach the first system directly communicating the change set with the second and third system, etc. (see the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action dated 03 October 2006). Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is not obvious in view of Rothrock and Bauer.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, and 32 to clarify that the present invention directly sends an object change set (1) from a first system to a second system and a third system, (2) from a second system to a third system and the first system, and (3) from the third system to the first system and the second system. These amendments find support on: page 2, lines 10-16;


page 8, lines 5-15 and 21-30; page 11, lines 1-7 and 15-20; page 9, line 13 through page 10, line 14; and FIG. 5, 502.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, and 32 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3 and 5-6, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 13 and 15-16, which depend upon claim 12, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 28 November 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com